

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05811 301917Z

67

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-20 NSC-10 OMB-01 MC-02 ACDA-19

CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01

PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 DRC-01 EB-11 COME-00

SCEM-02 INT-08 SCI-06 ABF-01 /147 W

----- 128300

R 301530Z NOV 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECDEF WASHDC

INFO SECSTATE WASHDC 2975

USIA WASHDC

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE USNATO 5811

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: DPC MINISTERIAL: PRESS

1. FOLL ARE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTIONS LIKELY TO BE ASKED
BY JOURNALISTS AT THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE'S ARRIVAL IN BRUSSELS
FOR MINISTERIAL DPC, OR IN ANY SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS WITH PRESS
HERE:

2. YOU HAVE SAID THAT YOU WANTED A REVIEW OF U.S. AGREEMENTS
WITH THE ALLIES ON THE QUESTION OF ACCESS TO AMERICAN EQUIPMENT
IN EUROPE. AT WHAT STAGE IS THE WORK ON THIS REVIEW? WILL IT
COME UP IN THE MINISTERIAL?

3. LAST SPRING, YOU WERE SAID TO HAVE GIVEN QUITE
A DIFFERENT APPRECIATION OF THE MILITARY BALANCE IN
EUROPE FROM THAT GIVEN BY ADMIRAL POSER OF NATO.
HAVE YOU RESOLVED THE DIFFERENCES? WILL YOU BE
GIVING A SIMILAR ASSESSMENT AT THIS MEETING?

4. THE JACKSON-NUNN AMENDMENT HAS JUST BECOME LAW.
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 02 NATO 05811 301917Z

WHAT'S YOUR PREDICTION: THAT THE ALLIES WILL BE
ABLE TO OFFSET 100 PER CENT OF THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS
LOSS FROM STATIONING TROOPS HERE, OR THAT SOME
WITHDRAWALS WILL BE MADE?

5. HOW BIG WOULD A WITHDRAWAL HAVE TO BE TO AFFECT SERIOUSLY THE AMERICAN FORCES' ABILITY TO CARRY OUT THEIR MISSION?

6. HOW BIG WOULD A WITHDRAWAL HAVE TO BE TO MAKE MBFR NO LONGER WORTH PURSUING?

7. AS A FORMER CIA CHIEF, HOW DO YOU THINK NATO'S INTELLIGENCE APPARATUS FUNCTIONED DURING THE MED-EAST CRISIS? DID YOUR DISAGREEMENT WITH ADMIRAL POSER LAST TIME MEAN THAT YOU HAVE SOME DOUBTS IN THIS AREA?

8. WHAT'S THE PENTAGON VIEW OF THE SOVIET MBFR PROPOSAL? IS THERE ANYTHING IN THERE THAT LOOKS INTERESTING?

9. DID ANY NATO ALLY EXCEPT PORTUGAL COOPERATE DURING THE U.S. RESUPPLY OPERATION TO ISREAL? WHAT ABOUT SPAIN?

10. HAVE THE MUTUAL RECRIMINATIONS BETWEEN THE U.S. AND HER NATO ALLIES, WHICH WERE SO LOUD AND FREQUENT DURING AND JUST AFTER THE PEAK

OF THE MID-EAST CRISIS, NOW FADED OUT? WHAT LASTING EFFECT DO YOU THINK THESE CHARGES AND COUNTER-CHARGES WILL HAVE ON (1) THE WAY THE ALLIANCE OPERATES IN FUTUE SIMILAR CRISES, AND (2) THE ATMOSPHERICS OF NATO, ESPECIALLY THE MINISTERIAL MEETING.

11. WHY WAS THE U.S. UNABLE TO DO BETTER ABOUT NOTIFYING ITS ALLIES ON THE ALERT? IS IT NOW RECOGNIZED IN WASHINGTON THAT SOME MISTAKES WERE MADE ON THIS SCORE? WHAT WILL BE DONE DIFFERENTLY IN THE FUTURE?

12. WHAT DO YOU THINK THE LONG-RANGE EFFECT OF THE MID-EAST WAR AND THE OIL CRISIS WILL BE ON THE ALLIANCE? SINCE, ACCORDING TO THE U.S., THE ALLIES REFUSED TO ACT LIKE GOOD ALLIES DURING THE CRISIS, WILL THE U.S. REFUSE TO HELP THEM WHEN THE OIL PINCH STARTS HURTING BADLY? CAN YOU STILL HOPE FOR DEFENSE IMPROVEMENTS AND BURDEN SHARING WHEN LIMITED OFFICIAL USE LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 03 NATO 05811 301917Z

THE EUROPEANS ARE AFRAID FOR THEIR OWN ECONOMIES? IRVING KRISTOL IN THE WALL STREET JOURNAL SAID THAT THE MID-EAST WAR SHATTERED THE ILLUSION THAT AN ALLIANCE REALLY EXISTED, ONE THAT WOULD OPERATE IN THE FACE OF PRESSURES AND TROUBLE. DOESN'T THAT REALLY SEEM TO BE THE CASE?

13. ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE ATTITUDE OF THE EUROPEANS UP TO NOW IN

THE MULTILATERAL BURDEN-SHARING WORK BEING DONE WITHIN NATO? WHAT IS YOUR IMPRESSION OF HOW THE GERMAN OFF-SET TALKS ARE GOING?

14. KAFTER THE MEETING ONLY) DO YOU CONSIDER THE EUROGROUP'S

REPORT ON DEFENSE IMPROVEMENTS AND BURDEN SHARING A GOOD ONE?
WILL IT SATISFY THE CONGRESS?

15. WHAT SPECIFIC PROPOSALS WILL YOU BE SUPPORTING FOR OFFSETTING
THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS LOSS ON THE MILITARY ACCOUNT?

16. WHAT DO (DID) THE DEFENSE MINISTERS HAVE TO DO AT THIS MEETING
RELATIVE TO MBFR? SINCE THERE IS AN AGREED ALLIED POSITION, WHAT IS
LEFT TO DISCUSS? THE SOVIET PROPOSAL?

17. (AFTER THE MEETING) WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE ON MULTILATERAL
BURDEN SHARING?

18. WHAT'S THE TIME FRAME NOW ON BURDEN SHARING? IS THE DEADLINE
NOW DETERMINED BY JACKSON-NUNN?

19. CAN YOU TELL US NOW WHAT A MULTILATERAL BURDEN-SHARING PACKAGE
MIGHT LOOK LIKE?

20. HOW MUCH DOES THE U.S. HOPE TO GET OUT OF THE GERMAN-AMERICAN
OFFSET AGREEMENT? WE SAW SOME RATHER HIGH FIGURES BEFORE THE NEGOTIA-
TIONS GOT UNDER WAY. WHAT'S THE PROBABLE RANGE NOW?

21. WILL THERE BE (WAS THERE) A DISCUSSION OF KEFLAVIK? HOW ARE THE
NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE ICELANDERS GOING?

22. (ARRIVAL) WILL YOU BE HAVING ANY BILATERAL CONVERSATIONS WHILE
YOU ARE HERE? WITH WHOM. WHAT WILL YOU DISCUSS?

RUMSFELD

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

PAGE 04 NATO 05811 301917Z

LIMITED OFFICIAL USE

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO05811
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731165/abqcedos.tel
Line Count: 144
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: LIMITED OFFICIAL USE
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <22-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <10-Oct-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DPC MINISTERIAL: PRESS
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
To: SECDEF INFO STATE
USIA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005